



Sawiuk, R, Taylor, W and Groom, NR (2017) Exploring formalized elite coach mentoring programmes in the UK: 'We've had to play the game'. Sport, Education and Society, 23 (6). pp. 619-631. ISSN 1357-3322

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/617259/>

Version: Accepted Version

Publisher: Taylor & Francis (Routledge)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1248386>

Please cite the published version

1 **Exploring formalized elite coach mentoring programmes in the UK:**

2 **‘We’ve had to play the game’**

3
4
5 Accepted for publication 11/10/16 *Sport, Education & Society*

6
7 Rebecca Sawiuk^{a*}, William G Taylor^b and Ryan Groom^b

8
9 ^a*Hertfordshire University, UK;* ^b*Manchester Metropolitan University, UK; Centre for*
10 *Research into Coaching (CRiC)*

11
12 *Corresponding author. Department of Human and Environmental Sciences, School of Life
13 and Medical Sciences, Hertfordshire University, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9AB. Email:
14 r.sawiuk@herts.ac.uk

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 To cite:

25 Sawiuk, R., Taylor, W. G., & Groom, R. (in press). Exploring formalized elite coach
26 mentoring programmes in the UK: ‘We’ve had to play the game’. *Sport, Education &*
27 *Society*. DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2016.1248386

Abstract

Formalized mentoring programmes have been implemented increasingly have been implemented by UK sporting institutions as a central coach development tool, yet claims supporting formal mentoring as an effective learning strategy are often speculative, scarce, ill-defined and accepted without verification. The aim of this study, therefore, was to explore some of the realities of formalized elite sports coaching mentoring programmes. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews with 15 mentors of elite coaches on formal programmes, across a range of sports. The findings were read through a Bourdieusian lens and revealed the importance of understanding the complexities of elite sports coaching environments, that elite sports coach development is highly specific and, therefore, should not be over-formalized, and how current elite sport coach mentoring programmes may be better conceptualized as a form of social control rather than being driven by pedagogical concerns. Following this empirically based analysis of practice, a number of implications for Governing Bodies (GBs), mentors and mentees were considered.

Keywords: Sports coaching, coach education, mentoring, formal coach learning, elite coach development, micro-politics.

Introduction

The need to broaden coaching's theoretical and empirical basis has been previously acknowledged within the coaching literature (e.g. Jones, 2006; Lyle & Cushion, 2010). However, Nelson *et al.* (2013) have cautioned that although an increase in theoretically informed delivery is evident, there seems to be a reluctance to assess the merits of existing modes of education before moving on to more fashionable pedagogical modes of delivery. For example, a number of scholars have suggested a variety of approaches which may be used to inform the education of coaches, such as the establishment of mentoring schemes (Bloom *et al.*, 1998), competency-based programmes (Demers *et al.*, 2006), problem-based learning (Jones & Turner, 2006), communities of practice (Culver & Trudel, 2008 and reflective practice (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001). However, within the sports coaching literature scant attention has been paid to exploring the efficacy and realities of such approaches in practice. This oversight is perhaps best illustrated within the sports coaching mentoring literature. For example, although formalized mentoring schemes have been considered a 'worthwhile addition to coach development' (Bloom *et al.*, 1998, p. 223), and have been viewed by coaches as an essential method contributing towards their development as a coach (Bloom *et al.*, 1995), similarly to mainstream mentoring literature (Noe *et al.*, 2002; Wanberg *et al.*, 2003), empirical research examining formal mentoring remains scarce (Bloom, 2013; Chambers, 2015). Typically, within the literature, mentoring situations are categorized as being either informal or formal across different contextual domains (Tourigny & Pulich, 2005). Informal mentoring refers to an organic mentorship that is unstructured and without a formal contract; it occurs through mutual identification and is often concerned with personal or professional development outcomes (Kram, 1985). These relationships allow for frequent personal feedback and interventions, usually because the mentor-mentee dyad occurs within the actual work setting (Tourigny & Pulich, 2005). Formal mentoring has been defined as 'a contractual relationship

1 where the terms are defined in such a way as to foster greater acceptance of and conformity to
2 formally recognized organisational norms and expectations' (Tourigny & Pulich, 2005, p. 69).
3 Commonly, formalized mentoring programmes are employed by organizations as
4 institutionalized in-house training programmes that promote the development of employee skill
5 sets, competencies, policies, procedures and standards (Tourigny & Pulich, 2005; Wright &
6 Smith, 2000). Although recommendations for 'best practice' exist for the utilization of these
7 formal schemes, scrutiny or empirical exploration is somewhat absent (Murray, 1991; Allen *et*
8 *al.*, 2006). Often, the process of formalizing institutional mentoring programmes involves a
9 number of key elements, such as establishing mentoring objectives, selecting and matching
10 mentors and protégés, setting achievable expectations and goals, outlining responsibility, and
11 duration and frequency of mentoring sessions or workshops (Tourigny & Pulich, 2005).
12 Mentoring within sports coaching remains an 'ill-defined activity' (Jones *et al.*, 2009, p. 280).
13 That is, despite the claims surrounding the adoption of coach mentoring schemes within sports
14 coaching, mentoring continues to lack clear conceptual clarity and is often depicted in a
15 fragmented manner (Bloom *et al.*, 1998; Jones *et al.*, 2009; Nash, 2003).

16 Unlike the centralized national sports education systems in North America (e.g.
17 National Canadian Coaches Association) formalized coach mentoring schemes in the UK
18 have been designed and implemented by individual sporting GBs. Consequently, these
19 formalized mentoring schemes lack a standardized curriculum, and the content of these
20 courses is dictated by the needs of the individual sporting body (e.g. more female coaches,
21 more UKCC Level 4 coaches, etc.). Indeed, considerable variation of coach mentoring
22 provision is evident within UK sports across UKCC Level and gender (cf. The FA, 2012).
23 Therefore, there remains the need to analyse the development of sports coach mentoring
24 schemes within the UK from an empirically based and theoretically informed perspective in
25 order to provide a sound conceptual basis for the implementation of such schemes.

1 In building upon previous work, Jones *et al.* (2009) have suggested that the next step is
2 'to generate empirical evidence regarding the current nature of mentoring in sports coaching in
3 order to inform more meaningful coach education programmes' (p. 276). In an attempt to
4 answer such a call, this study aims to empirically explore the realities of coach mentoring
5 within formalized elite sports contexts. In doing so, it seeks to provide a more complete
6 representation of the current practices employed within formalized elite coach mentoring
7 schemes in order to better understand the realities of elite coach mentoring. In addition, a
8 Bourdieusian reading of the field data is offered, to deepen the level of understanding of the
9 social context of mentoring practice (Bourdieu 2007, 2004b). The significance of this work is
10 grounded in the recognition that mentoring within elite sports coaching is distinctive in nature
11 (Griffiths & Armour, 2012), nuanced and contextually bound (Jones *et al.*, 2009) and uneven
12 in quality and outcomes (Cushion, 2006). Such a conceptualization acknowledges the inherent
13 complexity evident within the formal mentoring literature (e.g. Allen *et al.*, 2006; Chun *et al.*,
14 2012; Eby *et al.*, 2008; Eby & Lockwood, 2005; McManus & Russell, 1997). In this regard, an
15 empirical analysis of the current practices of formal mentors working with elite sports coaches
16 attempts to reflect the realities of formalized coach mentoring and may assist in the design of
17 future coach mentoring schemes.

18 19 **Methodology**

20 *Philosophical underpinnings*

21 Engaging more explicitly in both the philosophical and procedural elements of the
22 research process is an essential step to increase the quality of research within sports coaching
23 (Nelson *et al.*, 2014b; Nelson *et al.*, 2014c; Potrac *et al.*, 2014). In an attempt to explicitly
24 address this issue, the present study was conducted within the interpretivist paradigm (cf.
25 Potrac *et al.*, 2014) and underpinned by a relativist ontology (i.e. participants hold socially

constructed views of reality) and a subjectivist epistemology (i.e. knowledge is created through an interaction between the researchers and the participants). In addition, within the analysis of the findings, the paper draws on the work of Bourdieu to provide a theorised reading of the data and to illustrate the inherent social dynamics found within elite coach mentoring contexts (Grenfell, 2008). From a representational perspective, the present paper follows the traditional representational prose of the dominant form of representation within qualitative research, the ‘realist tale’, in that we, as authors, deploy a neutral voice, written in the third person (Groom *et al.*, 2014). However, it is important to recognize that this is a textual strategy and a decision made by the research team, rather than a *true* or *real* account of the complexity of the lived experiences of the participants (Groom *et al.*, 2014).

Participants

Following institutional ethical approval, mentors who mentored elite coaches across a range of mentoring schemes were contacted and informed about the purpose and nature of the present study. Following this initial contact, 15 participants were purposefully selected as formal coach mentors. The process was underpinned by a guiding frame: (1) holding the highest formal coaching award within their sport; (2) a minimum of 10 years of practical coaching experience; (3) had worked as a coach mentor for a minimum of three years. All participants have actively participated in a UK elite coach mentoring programme, which requires the mentor to contractually deliver mentoring sessions on behalf of a sporting institution.

<< INSERT TABLE HERE >>

Interviews and procedure

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the 15 participant mentors, either face to face ($n = 13$) in a private location close to the participant’s place of work or, where the

participants were unable to meet in person, via the phone ($n = 2$). All of the interviews were recorded via a Dictaphone and transcribed verbatim by the lead author. The participants' names have been replaced with pseudonyms within the text to preserve their anonymity; however, to contextualize the data, the participants' main sport/s are reported within Table: 1. alongside each data extract. The interviews were open in nature and allowed for the exploration of key themes regarding the participants' experiences within formal mentoring schemes. The interviews typically lasted from 45 to 60 minutes and were conducted in a flexible manner using open-ended questions and elaboration probes.

An interview guide was utilized in an attempt to structure the conversation towards the research aims of the study. A literature review was completed. Its findings, together with author 1's previous experience as a mentee on an elite sports coach mentoring scheme and author 2's experience as an educator on an elite sports coach mentoring scheme, increased the research team's theoretical sensitivity to the questionnaire design (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Questions broadly focused on exploring the participants' perceptions of their engagement with formal mentoring schemes.

Thematic analysis

For the purposes of this study, a data-driven inductive thematic approach was employed (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to stimulate useful comparisons between themes. Methodologically such an approach is informed by a phenomenological epistemology concerned with understanding meaning and experience as socially [re]produced through interactions, thus the importance of socio-cultural contexts and structural conditions of the context remain at the centre of the analysis process (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Consequently, the data analysis was not viewed as a singular event but instead can be better conceptualized as an iterative process between data and theory. However, it is important to recognize that as researchers we made

1 decisions on the data, and that the categories in the present study did not simply ‘emerge’ from
2 the data but rather are a result of ongoing analysis, interpretation and embedded critical
3 reflection by the research team. Following Taylor (2014: 189), we suggest that the analysis of
4 qualitative data is not easy; instead it is ‘often messy, at times confusing, and rarely presents a
5 complete picture’.

6 During the analysis process a method of working back and forth was adopted between
7 data and theory (Boyatzis, 1998). The research team met on a regular basis during the data
8 collection phase, and we talked aloud about the data and what we thought it meant (Taylor,
9 2014). The sharing of these thoughts and feelings was not a single isolated event but a
10 collective one, often involving us reconsidering and challenging our own and each other’s
11 ideas (Taylor, 2014). This process was themed around the importance of culture and context
12 in elite sports coach mentoring, the problematic nature of institutional agendas in elite sports
13 coach mentoring, the dangers of over-formalizing elite sports coach mentoring and micro-
14 politics in elite sports coach mentoring, which are discussed below and throughout the study.
15 Additionally, the creation of theoretical codes enabled potentially important concepts to be
16 explored through an iterative process in which the research team asked questions of the data
17 to assist in the development of insightful comparisons and analytical reflection (Boyatzis,
18 1998).

19 In the first instance, the primary researcher and author familiarized themselves with
20 the data sets by engaging in the process of transcription, which has been described as a key
21 phase of data analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes were then identified by the research
22 team (authors 1–3) in relation to the questions asked, and responses presented in a patterned
23 format. The data was interpreted by assessing the commonality of emerging articulated
24 themes, which in turn produced the first order categorization, for example institutional
25 influences impacting the formalized scheme. Secondly, individual occurrences were explored

across the first order themes to identify comparisons within the data set (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Results and discussion

Within this section, the paper utilizes the work of Bourdieu in attempting to shed light on the selected themes represented here. Particularly, it applies the concepts of field, habitus, capital, symbolic violence, doxa and misrecognition to the reading (Grenfell, 2008). Whilst it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide an outline of Bourdieu's body of theory, it should be acknowledged that to a limited degree it has helped to illuminate coaching research.

Taylor and Garratt (2010) used 'field and capital' to investigate the experience of coaches and the professionalisation of their practice; Cushion and Jones (2006) explored the verbal interaction of coaches, citing the 'symbolic violence' inherent in their exchanges with athletes; Taylor and McEwan (2012) used the notion of 'educational capital' to examine the nature of interprofessional relationships; and Noble and Watkin (2003) provided an interesting use of the concepts of 'habitus' and 'embodiment' within the sports training literature.

The culture and context of elite sports coach mentoring

This first section builds a case for and highlights some of the contextual nuances of elite sports coach mentoring within sport (Griffiths & Armour, 2012). The following extracts in this section explore how important it is for mentors to understand the elite sports milieu and how this differs across operational contexts, with reference to effective formalized mentoring and elite coach education. It further discusses the benefit of an elite sports mentor from a different sport or context. The following section highlights a number of examples of

1 how the participant mentors discussed the importance of context within elite coach
2 mentoring:

3
4 When you're working in sport and you do sport yourself you do have an
5 understanding of the environment people are operating within ... Sometimes there's
6 the element of rapport because there's that something in common and that can fast
7 track that relationship. (Mark)

8
9 In business if you're operating within a totally different context every time you don't
10 have an appreciation of the complexities of the environment [in] which the individual
11 is working. However, it doesn't seem to be an issue for the people from business that
12 you don't come from business, but I suspect if you come from sport it's more of an
13 issue: you understand it, you work it and you live it ... There's an element of culture,
14 the way sport has a mind-set and is set up, this desire or want or need to have this kind
15 of credibility around the technical element of sport. (Mark)

16
17 Formal mentoring has to happen. When you're embedded within the sport you're
18 much more situationally based; where I have physically had to come up here. So when
19 I worked in sailing, if a coach wandered into the office and we had a bit of a chat and
20 said 'do you want to grab a tea?' That informality is incredibly useful. That can't
21 happen in my role because I'm not embedded as I would like to be. (Simon)

22
23 Although elite sports coach mentoring delivery appears to be distinctive in nature, the
24 participant mentors identified the benefits of drawing upon mentors from outside the
25 mentees' sporting domain:

1
2 I would advocate at an elite level there's a stronger argument for the mentors to be
3 outside the sport, but having a mentor skill set to facilitate the development of the
4 elite coach is beneficial. Lower down the sports a mentor from the same sport can be
5 important, like the 'buddy-up' system. My overall feeling on mentoring is that it's
6 still very global and it's not specific. I think we need to differentiate between maybe
7 not only the demands between different sports and how mentors look within different
8 sports but more importantly at different levels and a coaching journey from where
9 they started coaching seriously to an elite end. (Danielle)

10
11 Similarly to the work of Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1992) within teacher education,
12 different forms of mentoring occur within different contexts. Bourdieu refers to these
13 emplotments as fields, which are common spaces where individuals and organizations
14 interact and mutually construct shared experiences (Bourdieu 2007: Grenfell, 2008). These
15 fields are often in conflict over resources and issues such as time, and are constrained by the
16 informality that Simon (sailing and canoe coach) values as being built by members as they
17 co-experience field conditions (Grenfell, 2008). Within business, Cox (2003) highlighted 'the
18 imperative that context places on the enhancement of professional practice, the implications it
19 holds for the use of standards and the opportunity that it provides for a creative approach to
20 coach/mentor development' (p. 21). Thus, mentors operating within a sports coaching context
21 require specialized coaching expertise and contextual sensitivity (Lyle & Cushion, 2010).

22 Within the present study, coach mentors describe scenarios whereby contextual
23 differences exist not only across mentoring domains (i.e. sport and business) but also between
24 different sports and within the developmental pathway in a single sport. As a result,
25 participant mentors suggest that the elite coach requires a unique, individualised mentoring

1 approach which takes longer and is more likely to address behaviour change. Furthermore,
2 the role requirements of high performance coaches demand an amplified contextual
3 knowledge base: something which has previously been highlighted as a shortcoming of
4 current coach education provision (Griffiths & Armour, 2012; Lyle & Cushion, 2010). The
5 work of Chesterfield *et al.* (2010) highlighted the problematic nature of coach education
6 programmes in the UK, in that they lack contextual sensitivity and are delivered in a ‘one-
7 size-fits-all’ approach. Bourdieu, in his consideration of the ‘naturalisation of best fit’,
8 applies the term ‘doxa’ to situations where certain cultural assumptions become embodied to
9 the degree that they are rarely questioned. Assumptions remain unspoken because they came
10 without speaking (Bourdieu, 2004a). The idea that the contextual field is not central in the
11 emergence of sport-related coaching norms is an example of doxa. The importance of place
12 and culture is amplified within the idea of habitus, which is a set of dispositions that colour
13 our everyday actions and provide us with aligned behaviours (Deer, 2008). Within the current
14 treatment of sports coach mentoring in the literature, coach education programmes suggest
15 this ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach will effectively upskill the coaching workforce, whereas elite
16 coach mentors in the current study suggest the need to revise this mode of delivery and to
17 challenge the doxa of the fields (Deer, 2008). Therefore, there remains a need to recognize
18 that elite coach mentees require a contextually bound individually focused development
19 programme based upon developing a reflective, flexible and critical understanding of the
20 coaching role.

21 22 *The problematic nature of institutional agendas in elite sports coach mentoring*

23 The employment of formal mentoring schemes by sporting institutions as a workforce
24 development tool continues to increase in popularity (Cushion, 2006). Often, institutions
25 utilizing this approach align the mentoring scheme to long-term objectives or the strategic

1 position of the institution, instead of adopting a bespoke approach for the coach mentee
2 (Bloom *et al.*, 1998; Tinning, 1996; Thomson, 1998). As a result, formal mentors feel
3 restricted in both the topic and format of mentoring delivery. The participant coach mentors
4 in this study highlighted a number of specific social and cultural issues within their sport,
5 which impacted the aim and the philosophy of the mentoring schemes:

6
7 At times the awards dictate the content; it's what is for the greater good of most. I
8 would like mentoring in the future to be more about philosophy and the things that
9 really do affect what we do every day. And it is about philosophy in some respects at
10 the moment, but the scheme was devised because of the perceived lack of highly
11 qualified female coaches. (Geoff)

12
13 It's really to take talented coaches who work within NGBs at the minute and really
14 fast track them and accelerate their development. So we are hoping there will be some
15 short-term gains in the role they're in at the moment but we are hoping they will
16 become the elite coaches of the future. And we are trying to fast track their
17 development by helping them with some of their skills and knowledge. (Dawn)

18
19 Further, the participants within the present study acknowledged how institutionally
20 driven agendas had problematically impacted their own mentoring schemes, as bespoke
21 coach development becomes neglected. Bourdieu suggests that the ability to challenge these
22 field-based agendas is based on the possession of various forms of capital (Grenfell, 2008).
23 Capital is essentially symbolic in nature and is used to influence your own and others' field
24 positions. Without such capital, be it institutional capital (such as working for an NGB) or the
25 symbolic capital inferred by the acquiring of higher coaching awards, the prevailing

1 conditions and discourses are hard to confront (Taylor & Garratt, 2010: Taylor and McEwan,
2 2012). In the participants' own words:

3
4 The coach themselves identifies the area of need, although there's a performance-
5 driven target by the organization. ... I'd probably say to a certain level formalized
6 mentoring could be of use but I think at a certain level, more towards the elite end,
7 coach development is so specific you tick the boxes but you might not actually be
8 developing the coach. (Danielle)

9
10 Often the format and mode of delivery of mentoring programmes are dictated by the
11 institution in line with providing measurable outcomes for funding purposes. Here, Adam
12 highlighted that:

13
14 Due to the [mentoring] scheme being tightly funded there's a few more bits that are
15 sort of overly measured [i.e. performance-driven targets]. I mean, my issue is funding
16 comes in, the programme gets developed, it's quite glossy, it's supposed to be
17 bespoke for the coach, [but] it's too structured at the moment. (Adam)

18
19 Obtaining funding for coach education adds limitations to the formalized mentoring
20 session and structure, which in turn drives the monitoring of mentoring effectiveness towards
21 an audit culture. These fields are, in turn, influenced by external fields that are more powerful
22 in terms of the control of and allocation of economic capital (e.g. sport body funding) (Taylor
23 & Garratt, 2010). Consequently, these external institutional pressures and stakeholder
24 influences may be problematic and confine coach mentor practice, which may, in turn, reduce
25 the value of the mentee's experience. Here, Tony noted that:

1
2 On the odd occasion, you might feel like sometimes the formalized scheme has got
3 the chains on you. I think that's when your experience, intuition, gut feeling, call it
4 whatever you like, help you because you would have been in a situation like that
5 before. There have been a couple of times where I have done that and it's not actually
6 worked. It hasn't worked for the mentee I'm working with. Afterwards, when I've
7 evaluated it, it's not worked for me either and I have to learn from those lessons.

8 (Tony)
9

10 Similarly to the work of Tourigny and Pulich (2005) within nursing, the participant
11 mentors described scenarios where institutional norms, hierarchical structures or political
12 influences dictated the format of delivery for the mentors. Indeed, one of the dangers of
13 implementing a sports coach mentoring scheme which is heavily driven by institutional
14 agendas and assessed through the collection of metrics is a reduction in the bespoke
15 educational impact of the mentoring scheme. The work of Hansford *et al.* (2004) explains
16 that such realities may be understood as the 'darker side' of mentoring (Duck, 1994; Long,
17 1997). In addition, this controlling of the field conditions can lead to 'misrecognition'; this
18 state, according to Bourdieu, produces an illusionary belief where agents are compliant to the
19 dominant agenda, believing it is the only and best option open to them (Bourdieu 2004a;
20 Grenfell, 2008).

21 Coach mentors in the present study noted the impact of 'tightly funded' schemes
22 which manifested into a structured, regulated and generic approach to coach mentoring
23 delivery. Furthermore, one of the difficulties institutions faced whilst designing and
24 implementing formalized mentoring programmes was the ongoing concern relating to
25 insufficient funding or the impact of funding being terminated before the programme was

1 established (cf. Long, 1997). Here, a number of financial pressures were placed upon the
2 demonstration of the success of sports coach mentoring schemes through the audit of tangible
3 increases in target demographics. However, such a climate may be contradictory to, and thus
4 discourage, supportive behaviour (Kram, 1985).

6 *The dangers of over-formalizing elite sports coach mentoring*

7 The over-formalizing of sports coach mentoring schemes occurs in numerous ways; for
8 example ridged structure, specific formats, generic workshops or conferences with rules and
9 regulations. As a result, these mentoring schemes reduce the bespoke value of mentoring and
10 learning outcomes for the mentorship (Jones *et al.*, 2009). This section outlines the extent to
11 which over-formalizing the mentoring process is influenced by the institutions' desire to
12 attain continuous funding and the problematic nature of measuring programme effectiveness.
13 The threat of a reduction in or complete withdrawal of funding manifests itself as an act of
14 symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2007), where compliance and orthodoxy are rewarded capital
15 above localism and bespoke development. Here, coach mentors expressed their concerns
16 about over-formalizing the schemes due to the complex nature of measuring mentee
17 development:

18
19 I think it's important, the political environment the coach sits in. Some [contexts] are
20 so large the formalized process just gets the same [delivery] to every individual. But
21 they all come with different experiences and are individuals and will need different
22 things. ... It's finding the right people to mentor and it doesn't become so washy that
23 nothing is achieved. And I think that's the sad thing, politically, that if you look at
24 processes with players there's a formal monitoring process of where funding is given
25 to the development of a player and you can see that through physiological data, or

1 performance data or rankings. And I think that in many respects we take that
2 [approach] and we try and apply it to coach education where it shouldn't be as
3 formalized. (Danielle)

4
5 Christian outlined a number of realities of the audit culture within which many of the
6 elite sports mentoring programmes operate:

7
8 Often, I mean there's a real challenge out there because if we talk strictly, you know,
9 funders would say 'if we are going to fund a programme we want to know exactly
10 how many people are on the programme. We want to know the exact outcomes of the
11 programme and we want to measure the processes.' And what we are looking at is a
12 natural relationship which has troughs and peaks with points of contact and it doesn't
13 always fit in with a structured programme or recording form. So on one end you've
14 got this real need for structure and on the other you've got the need for a natural
15 relationship, which may or may not work. (Christian)

16
17 Interestingly, Arthur highlighted the political pressures placed upon publicly funded
18 formal mentoring programmes that are targeted for elite coach development:

19
20 Who accredits a mentor? The only real accreditation is from the coach or athlete
21 they're working with. The accreditation is, 'I need to see you again next week', but
22 of course we can't do that if we are using public money to run this programme so we
23 have had to find a way to assess people against a competence framework which is a
24 real pain in the arse. It's subjective; it's really difficult to say how self-aware
25 somebody is. You know we can spend hours doing it, and the sad thing is, we've had

1 to play the game. We appreciate we live in a political world and sometimes we have
2 to do it. It's not right but that's what we have had to do, so we do have a framework
3 against which we assess. (Arthur)

4
5 Such findings are mirrored in the work of Roberts (2000) who argued that excessive
6 structure and imposed guidelines upon mentorships could hinder the development of the
7 mentee. A further factor discussed by Ragins and Cotton (1999) is the complex nature of
8 balancing the bespoke nature of the mentorship with the structure and expectations of the
9 formal agenda. Philosophically, mentoring may be considered to operate on a continuum
10 from 'coach-centred programmes' to 'institutionally driven programmes'. Coach-centred
11 approaches may focus upon assisting coaches to become 'the best that they can be', where the
12 role of the coach mentor is that of a *facilitator of learning* (Nelson *et al.*, 2014a). For
13 Bourdieu (2004a), the corporation of education and the control of what is valued in learning
14 rarely serve those whom they were designed to educate. Learning, in this case, becomes
15 instrumental for both the agency it serves and those actors within that field who lack the
16 capital to effectively challenge, thus contributing to the field doxa by being cast 'silently
17 silenced' (Mathiesen, 2004). The role of the coach mentor in an institutionally driven
18 programme would be to ensure that mentees progress in line with a competence framework,
19 ensuring the institutional agendas are met, often with the aim of securing continued financial
20 support. The coach mentors were acutely aware of the difficulties associated with working
21 within highly politicalized environments where a number of stakeholders held contrasting
22 agendas (Jones & Wallace, 2005), and the impact that those influences often placed upon
23 formal mentoring schemes (i.e. over-formalizing mentoring schemes reduces the
24 individualised, bespoke, mentee-centred nature of the learning experience). Consequently, in
25 an attempt to develop the mentees in accordance with measurable modes of delivery, generic

workshops, sessions or conferences are often also implemented by GBs, which at times results in an ineffective decontextualized ‘tick box’ approach to coach learning (Chesterfield *et al.*, 2010; Nelson *et al.*, 2013).

Micro-politics in elite sports coach mentoring

The thematic analysis of the data further revealed how formalized elite sports mentoring programmes, like coaching more broadly, are not immune from social and political pressures from a number of stakeholders who have, at times, contradictory agendas (Jones & Wallace, 2005). Drawing upon the work of Ball (1987) and Blasé (1991), Potrac and Jones (2009) have highlighted that, when applied to sports coaching, micro-politics encapsulates the ‘political interactions that take place between social actors in different organizational settings’ (p. 225). More specifically, micro-politics relates to ‘the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals’ (Blasé, 1991, p. 11). For Bourdieu, the social is relational: each actor attempting to maintain an advantageous position within each field as it struggles with constrained resources. An individual’s own position and security in each field are governed by the value accrued by various forms of capital; this process only gives a temporary sense of security as outside forces determine the symbolic value these are afforded (Bourdieu, 2004b). Micro-political intercourse is a display of this unsettling condition and where individuals struggle to enhance or maintain field location. The following extracts highlight the micro-political nature of elite sports coaching mentoring programmes, particularly with regard to social power and interpersonal influence:

One of the KPIs [Key Performance Indicators] for the future will be to get as many mentees onto the Level 4 as possible [UKCC Level 4]. All of them have to be Level 4 by 2016, which is what canoeing have requested; which is useful because the whole

1 issue is to get people to engage in coaching and their own development, and you can
2 either do that by inspiring people to do that, or with the carrot and the stick. (Simon)

3
4 Importantly, Geoff highlighted that he was well aware that elite sports coach
5 mentoring programmes may be viewed as a form of formal power to achieve specific goals:

6
7 Our mentoring scheme, the prime aim is to help female coaches get higher
8 qualifications, whereas the men's scheme is not necessarily for that ... If you are
9 asking 'is our mentoring scheme a form of social control?', absolutely, I am sure it is.
10 Now, do we try and guard against that? Yes. How? Well, in discussions in trying to
11 encourage people to look at solving problems in different ways. But we are all a
12 product of our society. (Geoff)

13
14 The previous extracts highlighted the potential for elite sports coach mentoring
15 schemes to be used to control the career development of mentees. Indeed, Simon made the
16 point that you can inspire people 'with the carrot and the stick', whilst Geoff recognized that
17 formal coach mentoring schemes can be seen as a form of 'social control'. The following
18 extract highlights an extension of one of the formalized elite sports mentoring programmes
19 and some of the micro-political realities of trying to encourage knowledge sharing:

20
21 The second strand of it [the mentoring scheme] was to mentor the assistant coaches.
22 Both our main coaches were foreign, university educated and had coaching degrees.
23 One [was] running the coach education system in Finland, very bright, very switched
24 on, [and was] also running the international federation shooting training academy,
25 working with very experienced Olympic medal winning coaches. Try as I may I could

1 not get them to do any mentoring whatsoever and that was a real disappointment. And
2 after I saw that this was happening, this is really when I started the programme,
3 because I had hoped to do it even more informally as a leader-follower type of
4 mentoring, [but] they didn't want to do it. I also felt the time wasn't there, but again I
5 instinctively felt that a lot of it was 'my secrets, my power, my knowledge, and I am
6 not sure where I am going in the future and may not have a role in Great Britain. I
7 don't want to tell you all my secrets.' (Steve)

8
9 The following paired quotes from Arthur and David highlight the issues that mentors
10 and mentees face working within the same sport:

11
12 We find the coaches much prefer to be coached by somebody who doesn't have an
13 agenda in their sport. Often NGBs will employ mentors from within and they are
14 often seen very suspiciously as a spy. As soon as you have that there's no trust, so
15 mentoring doesn't happen. (Arthur)

16
17 Sometimes I ask my mentor 'how would you do this?' His responses are not as clear
18 or forthcoming as I'd like. I sometimes feel like it's because it's a competitive
19 exchange, in terms of, you know, his athletes doing well and my athletes doing well
20 because they compete against each other, and it's been a problem. (David)

21
22 Again, one of the stark realities faced by many GBs is the availability and willingness
23 of senior coaches to engage in mentoring programmes as coach mentors. This is particularly
24 evident within elite sporting contexts where coaches may be competing for the same
25 employment opportunities in the future. Each coach's habitus is one that emerges in a culture

1 where competition and competitiveness are rewarded and a disposition towards self-
2 preservation helps to ensure longevity in the field (Bourdieu, 2004b; Grenfell, 2008). Sharing
3 sporting capital in the form of a free exchange of knowledge may be regarded as a weakening
4 of individual capital (Taylor & McEwan, 2012). In this regard, this study presents some
5 initial findings which suggested that to progress their own careers senior coaches may, in
6 some instances, purposely resist engagement within mentoring programmes. Steve
7 highlighted how some coaches were keen to retain their ‘secrets’, ‘power’ and ‘knowledge’ to
8 protect themselves from vulnerability and further their own individual career aspirations.

10 **Conclusion**

11 This study aimed to address the dearth of empirical work exploring the realities of
12 formalized elite sports coach mentoring. Specifically, this work sought to generate an
13 empirically based picture of current practices in elite sports mentoring contexts in order to
14 inform more meaningful coach education programmes (Jones *et al.*, 2009). Following a
15 thematic analysis of the data, four principle themes were generated which provided additional
16 insights into the realities of formalized elite sports coach mentoring programmes. These
17 themes were subjected to a Bourdieusian reading, which, it is argued, provided a richer
18 insight into the political and cultural grammar of elite coach mentoring.

19 First, elite sports coach mentoring is contextually bound and distinctive in nature;
20 thus, mentors operating within a sports coaching context require specialized coaching
21 expertise and contextual sensitivity (Griffiths & Armour, 2012; Lyle & Cushion, 2010). That
22 is, knowledge, value systems, competition and interpersonal skills will vary across coaching
23 domains, which in turn requires coach mentoring approaches to be context sensitive.
24 Coaching domains, therefore, necessitate behaviours, practice and expertise to suit the
25 domain the coach is operating within. However, the extent to which generic or cross-sport

mentoring may impact upon coach learning remains an as yet unexplored avenue for future coach learning research.

Second, formalized mentoring schemes are frequently driven by a number of, at times contradictory, agendas, which often served to fulfil the political agendas of the institution through meeting GB coaching workforce demographic targets (cf. Jones & Wallace, 2005). Each sporting domain, in terms of a Bourdieusian notion of field, is one of internal tensions and subject to the influence of political field, which governs economic capital (resources and money) and symbolic capital in terms of the value placed on each sport by organizations such as UK Sport and the British Olympic Association (Taylor & Garratt, 2010; Taylor & McEwan, 2012). Furthermore, formal mentoring schemes were seen to be important in sustaining and increasing funding for their sport from national funding bodies. From an internal GB perspective, formal mentoring schemes were identified as a vehicle to clearly demonstrate the success of current coach education programmes in coping with an increasingly evident audit culture within elite sport.

Third, a number of dangers existed if mentoring schemes were over-formalized and coach learners were required to progress through generic training programmes. Here, overly rigid programmes reduce the bespoke nature of the learning requirements of elite sports coaches (cf. Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Therefore, over-formalized schemes designed primarily to satisfy a competence framework approach run the risk of only satisfying institutional agendas, which at times results in an ineffective decontextualized approach to coach learning (cf. Chesterfield *et al.*, 2010).

Fourth, from a micro-political perspective, elite sports coaching mentoring programmes held significant potential as a tool for social and political control of the coaching workforce, whilst at the same time potential mentors could be seen to exert resistance to such programmes to further their own future career opportunities (cf. Ball, 1987; Blasé, 1991;

Potrac & Jones, 2009). A great deal of interest in the pedagogical value of formalized coach mentoring programmes is evident within the sports coaching literature, but similarly to the suggestion of Jones and Wallace (2005), elite sports coaching mentoring programmes are not immune from the tussles of stakeholders' at times contradictory agendas. As such, directors of elite sports mentoring schemes should recognize the tension between the individual goals and agendas of potential coach mentors and the institutional goals and agendas which often drive formal mentoring programmes.

In summary, this paper highlights several important issues for GBs, mentors and mentees to consider when engaging in formalized elite sports coach mentoring schemes. Whilst coach learning may remain, at least implicitly, the overarching goal of formalized elite sports coach mentoring programmes, consideration should be given to the institutional context and associated pressures upon stakeholders to 'tick boxes', 'hit targets' and maintain and increase levels of funding. Furthermore, conflicting institutional and individual agendas may limit the number of senior coach mentors who are willing to participate within formalized mentoring programmes because of concerns regarding the reduction in future career opportunities. Finally, it is important to recognize that whilst some elements of sports coaching may remain generic across sporting domains, there exists a need to educate coaches in a contextually sensitive manner if coaches are to be given an educational programme which they value and which is useful and relevant in informing their everyday coaching practice.

References

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T. & Lentz, E. (2006) Mentorship behaviours and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: closing the gap between research and practice, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 567–578.

- 1 Ball, S. J. (1987) *The micro-politics of the school: towards a theory of school organization*
2 (London, Methuen).
- 3 Blasé, J. (1991) *The politics of life in schools: power, conflict and co-operation* (Newbury
4 Park, CA, Sage).
- 5 Bloom, G. (2013) Mentoring for sports coaches. In: P. Potrac, W. Gilbert & J. Denison (Eds),
6 *Routledge handbook of sports coaching*. (London, Routledge), 476–485.
- 7 Bloom, G., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. & Salmela, J. (1998) The importance of mentoring
8 in the development of coaches and athletes, *International Journal of Sports*
9 *Psychology*, 29(3), 267–281.
- 10 Bloom, G. A., Salmela, J. H. & Schinke, R. J. (1995) Expert coaches' view on the training of
11 developing coaches. In: R. Vanfraechem-Raway & Y. Vanden Auweele (Eds),
12 *Proceedings of the Ninth European Congress on Sport Psychology* (Brussels,
13 Belgium, Free University of Brussels), 401–408.
- 14 Bourdieu, P. (2004a) *Acts of Resistance: against the new myths of our time* (Cambridge, UK,
15 Polity Press).
- 16 Bourdieu, P (2004b) *Science of Science and Reflexivity* (Cambridge, UK, Polity Press).
- 17 Bourdieu, P. (2007) *In other words: essays towards a reflective sociology* (Cambridge, UK,
18 Polity Press).
- 19 Boyatzis, B. E. (1998) *Transforming qualitative information: thematic analysis and code*
20 *development* (London, Sage).
- 21 Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research*
22 *in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- 23 Chambers, F. C. (2015) *Mentoring in physical education and sports coaching*. (London,
24 Routledge).

- 1 Chesterfield, G., Potrac, P. & Jones, R. L. (2010) 'Studentship' and 'impression
2 management': coaches' experiences of an advanced soccer coach education award,
3 *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(3), 299–314.
- 4 Chun, J. U., Sosik, J. J. & Yun, N. (2012) A longitudinal study of mentor and protégé
5 outcomes in formal mentoring relationships, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*,
6 33(8), 1071–1094.
- 7 Cox, E. (2003) The Contextual Imperative: implications for coaching and mentoring,
8 *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 1(1), 1–9.
- 9 Culver, D. & Trudel, P. (2008) Clarifying the concept of communities of practice in sport,
10 *International Journal of Sports Coaching*, 3(1), 1–10.
- 11 Cushion, C. (2006) Mentoring: Harnessing the power of experience. In: R. L. Jones (Ed), *The
12 sports coach as educator: re-conceptualising sports coaching* (London, Routledge),
13 128–144.
- 14 Cushion, C. & Jones, R. L. (2006) Power, Discourse, and Symbolic Violence in Professional
15 Youth Soccer: The Case of Albion Football Club, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(2),
16 142–161
- 17 Deer, C. (2008) Doxa. In: M Grenfell (Ed) *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts* (Stockfield UK,
18 Acuman), 199–130.
- 19 Demers, D., Woodburn, A. J. & Savard, C. (2006) The development of an undergraduate
20 competency-based coach education program, *The Sports Psychologist*, 20, 162–173.
- 21 Duck, S. (1994) Stratagems, spoils and a serpent's tooth: on the delights and dilemmas of
22 personal relationships. In: W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds), *The dark side of
23 interpersonal communication* (Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum), 3–24.

- 1 Eby, L.T. & Lockwood, A. (2005) Protégés and mentors' reactions to participating in formal
2 mentoring programmes: a qualitative investigation, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*,
3 67(3), 441–58.
- 4 Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T. & DuBois, D. (2008) Does mentoring matter? A
5 multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals,
6 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 254–267.
- 7 Feiman-Nemser, S. & Parker, M. (1992) *Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S.*
8 *Programs for beginning teachers* (Special Report, National Centre for Research on
9 Teacher Learning).
- 10 Grenfell, M. (2008) (Ed) *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts* (Stockfield UK, Acuman).
- 11 Gilbert, W. D. & Trudel, P. (2001) Learning to coach through experience: reflection in model
12 youth sport coaches, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21(1), 16–34.
- 13 Griffiths, M. & Armour, K. (2012) Mentoring as a formalized learning strategy with
14 community sports volunteers, *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*,
15 20(1), 151–173.
- 16 Groom, R., Nelson, L., Potrac, P. & Smith, B. (2014) Writing and representing research. In:
17 L. Nelson, R. Groom & P. Potrac (Eds), *Research methods in sports coaching*.
18 (London, Routledge), 86–97.
- 19 Hansford, B., Ehrich, C. & Tennent, L. (2004) Formal mentoring programs in education and
20 other professions: a review of the literature, *Educational Administration Quarterly*,
21 40(4), 518–540.
- 22 Jones, R .L. (2006) *The sports coach as educator: re-conceptualising sports coaching*
23 (London, Routledge).
- 24 Jones, R. L., Harris, R. & Miles, A. (2009) Mentoring in sports coaching: a review of the
25 literature, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 14(3), 267–284.

- 1 Jones, R. L. & Turner, P. (2006) Teaching coaches to coach holistically: the case for a
2 Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*,
3 11(2), 181–202.
- 4 Jones, R. L. & Wallace, M. (2005) Another bad day at the training ground: coping with
5 ambiguity in the coaching context, *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(1), 119–134.
- 6 Kram, K. E. (1985) *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organisational life*
7 (Glenview, IL, Scott, Foresman).
- 8 Long, J. (1997) The dark side of mentoring, *Australian Educational Research*, 24, 115–123.
- 9 Lyle, J. & Cushion, C. (2010) *Sports coaching professionalisation and practice* (Edinburgh,
10 Elsevier, Church Livingston).
- 11 Mathiesen, T. (2004) *Silently silenced; essays on the creation of acquiescence in modern*
12 *society* (Winchester, UK, Waterside Press).
- 13 McManus, S. & Russell, J. (1997) New directions for mentoring research: An examination of
14 related constructs, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 51(1), 145–161.
- 15 Murray, M. (1991) *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass).
- 16 Nash, C. (2003) Development of a mentoring system within coaching practice, *Journal of*
17 *Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 2(2), 1–10.
- 18 Nelson, L., Cushion, C. & Potrac, P. (2013) Enhancing the provision of coach education: The
19 recommendations of UK coaching practitioners, *Physical Education and Sport*
20 *Pedagogy*, 18(2), 204–218
- 21 Nelson, L., Cushion, C., Potrac, P. & Groom, R. (2014a) Carl Rogers, learning and
22 educational practice: Critical considerations and applications in sports coaching,
23 *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(5), 513–531.
- 24 Nelson, L., Groom, R. & Potrac, P. (2014b) *Research methods in sports coaching* (London,
25 Routledge).

- 1 Nelson, L., Potrac, P. & Groom, R. (2014c) The place of theory. In: L. Nelson, R. Groom &
2 P. Potrac (Eds), *Research methods in sports coaching* (London, Routledge), 76–85.
- 3 Noble, G. & Watkin, M. (2003) So, how did Bourdieu learn to play tennis? Habitus,
4 consciousness and Habituation, *Cultural Studies* 17(3–4), 520– 539.
- 5 Noe, R. A., Greenberger, D. B. & Wang, S. (2002) Mentoring: What we know and where we
6 might go, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 21(2), 129–
7 173.
- 8 Potrac, P. & Jones, R. L. (2009) Power, conflict and co-operation: Towards a micro-politics
9 of coaching, *Quest*, 61(2), 223–236.
- 10 Potrac, P., Nelson, L., & Jones, R. (2014) Interpretivist. In: L. Nelson, R. Groom & P. Potrac
11 (Eds), *Research methods in sports coaching* (London, Routledge), 31–41.
- 12 Ragins, B. R. & Cotton, J. L. (1999) Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men
13 and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships, *Journal of Applied*
14 *Psychology*, 84(4), 529–50.
- 15 Roberts, A. (2000) Mentoring revisited: A phenomenological reading of the literature,
16 *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 8(2), 145–170.
- 17 Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for*
18 *developing grounded theory* (2nd edition). (Thousand Oaks, Sage).
- 19 Taylor, W. (2014) Analysis of qualitative data. In: L. Nelson, R. Groom & P. Potrac (Eds),
20 *Research methods in sports coaching* (London, Routledge), 181–191.
- 21 Taylor, W. G. & Garratt, D. (2010) The professionalisation of sports coaching: relations of
22 power, resistance and compliance, *Sport Education and Society*, 15(1), 121–139.
- 23 Taylor, W. G. & McEwan, I. M. (2012) From interprofessional working to transprofessional
24 possibilities: the new age of sports coaching in the United Kingdom, *Sport Coaching*
25 *Review*, 1(1),38–51.

- 1 The FA (2012) Game changer: The plan for women's football in England: 2013–18.
2 Retrieved on 19th July 2013 from: [http://www.thefa.com/News/2012/oct/game-](http://www.thefa.com/News/2012/oct/game-changer-womens-football.aspx)
3 [changer-womens-football.aspx](http://www.thefa.com/News/2012/oct/game-changer-womens-football.aspx)
4 Thomson, B. (1998) The mentor coach and coaching, *Proceedings of Coach '98: Tomorrow's*
5 *World Today* (Glasgow, Scottish Sports Council).
6 Tinning, R. (1996) Mentoring in the Australian physical education teacher education context:
7 Lessons from cooking turkeys and tandoori chicken. In: M. Mawer (Ed) *Mentoring in*
8 *Physical Education: Issues and insight* (Brighton, Falmer Press), 197–216.
9 Tourigny, L. & Pulich, M. (2005) A critical examination of formal and informal mentoring,
10 *The Health Care Manager*, 24(1), 68–76.
11 Wanberg, R., Welsh, E. T. & Hezlett, S.A. (2003) Mentoring research: A review and
12 dynamic process model, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*,
13 22, 39–124.
14 Wright, S. & Smith, D. (2000) A case for formalized mentoring, *Quest*, 52(2), 200–213.

Pseudonym	Age	Gender	Sport/s	Background	Formal Mentoring Experience
<i>Adam</i>	44	Male	Hockey	International coaching experience, coach educator and mentor.	12 years'
<i>Alfie</i>	59	Male	Athletics	National coach, coach educator and mentor.	8 years'
<i>Arthur</i>	48	Male	Cricket & rugby	National coach, coach educator and mentor.	10 years'
<i>Christian</i>	36	Male	Athletics & cycling	National coach, coach educator and mentor.	3 years'
<i>Danielle</i>	42	Female	Hockey & netball	National coach and mentor.	3 years'
<i>David</i>	48	Male	Athletics	National coach and mentor.	3 years'
<i>Dawn</i>	31	Female	Olympic sports	Head of a formal mentoring programme and mentor.	6 years'
<i>Geoff</i>	58	Male	Football	Head of a formal mentoring programme and international coaching experience.	13 years'
<i>Lawrence</i>	48	Male	Football	National coach, coach educator and mentor.	5 years'
<i>Lucy</i>	24	Female	Football	Club mentor.	3 years'
<i>Mark</i>	36	Male	Olympic sports/business	Head of a formal mentoring programme and mentor.	6 years'
<i>Sally</i>	48	Female	Athletics	Performance Director, national coach and mentor.	4 years'
<i>Simon</i>	48	Male	Water & Olympic sports	International coaching experience, coach educator and mentor.	13 years'
<i>Steve</i>	64	Male	Shooting	Performance Director, international coach and mentor.	14 years'
<i>Tony</i>	47	Male	Football	National coach, coach educator and mentor.	7 years'

1

2 Table 1. Participant Demographics.

3

